DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 795 RC 006 682

AUTHOR	Butler, Richard R.; Baird, Andrew W.
TITLE	Status Projections of Lower Social Strata Pre-Adolescents: A Focus on Some Intervening Social Psychological Factors.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Feb 73
NOTE	41p.; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, Atlanta, Georgia, February 1973
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Aspiration; *Cultural Traits; Educational Status Comparison; Grade 5; Grade 6; Mothers; Negroes; Occupational Aspiration; Psychological Characteristics; *Rural Urban Differences; Sex Differences; *Social Status; Statistical Analysis; Students; *Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	Appalachia; *South

ABSTRACT

A cluster of social psychological variables--academic motivation, self-concept, and significant others influence--as they intervene between other independent variables and the child's status projections, were examined in this study. Data came from an extensive questionnaire survey, conducted in 1969, of 1,412 lower social strata mother-child pairs. Residential-racial subgroupings surveyed were (1) rural Appalachian white students and their mothers from Kentucky, Tennessee, and North Carolina; (2) rural Black students and their mothers from Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina; and (3) urban Black students and their mothers from Alabama, Kentucky, and Virginia. It was concluded that occupational and educational status projections appeared to have different paths of influence and that occupational status projections tended to be relatively independent of criteria determining life chances while educational projections were considerably more influenced by socioeconomic, ability, and self-evaluative factors. Implications of the study were that any attempt to treat occupational and educational status projections together as part of any constellation concept such as ambition can be questioned and that the more definitive antecedents of the child's educational status projection, coupled with greater explained variance and more anticipatory deflection in educational expectations, possibly indicate less idealism in educational projections than in occupational projections. (HBC)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 071796

Status Projections of Lower Social Strata Pre-Adolescents: A Focus on Some Intervening Social Psychological Factors

Richard R. Butler and Andrew W. Baird

Social Science Research Center
Mississippi State University

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, Rural Sociology Section, Atlanta, Georgia, February, 1973. These data are from Southern Regional Project S-63, funded by U. S. D. A. The authors wish to acknowledge the contributions of:

Zimmie Albert and Lois Southworth, Department of Child Development and Family Relations, University of Tennessee; Charles Proctor, Department of Experimental Statistics, North Carolina State University; and A. Lee Coleman, Department of Sociology, University of Kentucky.

RC006682

INTRODUCTION

As research on mobility and achievement orientations has accumulated, research efforts have become increasingly analytical rather than descriptive, and increased attention to social psychological variables has resulted. These two interrelated trends are more than merely the examination of a larger number of more diversified variables which may be associated with status achievement orientations. These trends represent an attempt to explain certain aspects of career orientation, such as occupational and educational status projections, in terms of the process involved.

Ascertaining this process necessitates the examination of the relative influence of variables intervening between antecedents such as family background, family structure, and measured intelligence and the dependent status projections. This need is supported by an emerging body of literature which suggests that while social class and measured intelligence have traditionally been shown to have positive correlation with occupational and educational status projections (Haller and Miller, 1967; Kuvlesky, 1969), there is ample reason to question direct relationships. That is, the relationships between antecedent variables and status projections have been explained, in part, by social psychological factors such as parental encouragement and parent-child relations (Sewell and Shah, 1968; Kandel and Lesser, 1969; Wilbert, Schafer, and Sinclair, 1970). These findings raise a question about the nature of stratification as a major source of variation in achievement values and call for more attention to additional intervening variables.

Numerous studies of youths' educational and occupational projections have been concerned with the identification of relevant independent social

psychological factors such as parental encouragement and aspirations (Kandel and Lesser, 1969), motivation to achieve (Rosen and D'Andrade, 1959; Brim, 1965) and self-concept (Slocum, 1958; Herriott, 1963; Brim, 1965). Only recently, however, has there been much concerted effort to examine such social psychological factors as an important cluster of intervening variables. For example, Sewell, Haller and Ohlendorf (1970) have developed a complex model of the educational and occupational status attainment process. Congruent with a reference group perspective, it links socioeconomic status and measured intelligence with educational and occupational attainment by way of the influence of significant others as well as by educational and occupational aspirations. Also representative of the focus on intervening social psychological variables is Picou and his associates' (1972) examination of academic achievement orientation and significant others influence in a sequential model explaining educational expectations.

The objective of this paper is the examination of a cluster of social psychological variables; academic motivation, self-concept, and significant others influence, as they intervene between other independent variables and the child's status projections.

CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

The major assumption operative throughout this chapter is that aspirations, with regard to projected status attainment, reflect generalized cultural values. Educational and occupational status projections are conceived as concepts from which success and achievement values may be inferred.

The cultural in-put of the achievement ethos (see Williams, 1970, for discussion) has been implied as profound in Merton's (1968:185ff) thesis that the achievement ideology pervades all social strata in America. Support for Merton's thesis is to be found in the fact that regardless of social class, ethnicity, or age, high prestige occupations are aspired to in the United States (Empy, 1956; Stephenson, 1957; Antonovsky and Lerner, 1959; Gist and Bennett, 1963; Hamilton, 1964; Kuvlesky, 1969). In light of the lack of knowledge concerning the nature of specific occupations (Slocum, 1966:186, Taylor, 1968:189) occupational prestige is the main basis on which aspirations are based (McClelland, 1955:239; Merton, 1968:185ff., 292).

Important for this study is children's awareness of occupational prestige, their perception of the opportunity structure, and their social class self-identification. A recent study of black and white children from grades three through twelve reveals that as early as elementary school: (1) children rate occupations in an order almost identical to that of adults; (2) although children do not accept the doctrine of equality of opportunity for all, a majority of every age, race, and socioeconomic level are optimistic about their own personal opportunity; and (3) children, like adults, tend to select the middle class as their social locale (Rosenberg and Simmons, 1971).

A major contention of this work is that many investigators have obscured the cultural basis of aspiration (as operationalized in this and most aspiration studies) by their contention that the high "success goals" of young people are highly "unrealistic" in view of objectively slim possibility of attainment (Lott and Lott, 1963; Coleman, et.al., 1966; Slocum,

1966; Cosby and Picou, 1971). The "unrealistic-realistic" conception of aspiration, largely derived from the psychological developmental theories of occupational "choice," is incongruent with some evidence that occupational aspirations do not become more "realistic" through high school ... "conversely many become less 'realistic' " (Kuvlesky, 1969:18). In the absence of realistic or objective bases for occupational aspirations, coupled with perception of the occupational prestige hierarchy, cultural values regarding occupational goals provide the context of aspirations. That is to say, in this author's perspective the high success goals of young people are not "unrealistic" personalized goal-commitments, but rather "idealistic" or cultural goals given individual expression.

Although many authors have conceptualized aspirations as "ideal" phenomena, some have made a distinction between aspirations and expectations, the latter being termed "realistic" (Stephenson, 1959; Han, 1969).

The position forwarded here is that both are within the "idealistic" realm of analysis. Expectation is not viewed as a realistic appraisal of future goal attainment, but rather the projected level of goal attainment resulting from the extent to which awareness of limitations deflects the projection from an idealized aspiration. This is congruent with Haller's (1968) clarification of aspiration in which he points out that expectations are not realistic but are based on significant others' expectations. In other words, whereas aspirations are indicators of the extent of assimilation of cultural values, expectations are indicators of the extent to which cultural values are modified by perception of significant others' expectations (Haller, 1968) or by perception of barriers to the attainment of the most idealized status (Aldrich, 1970).

Support for this conceptualization of expectations as being within the ideal level of abstraction can be found in studies of southern rural youth that indicate a congruence between aspirations and expectations for a majority of respondents, while some respondents actually have expectations that are higher than aspirations (Ameen, 1968; Wright, 1968; Lever, 1969). Furthermore, in expectations alone, considerable upward intergenerational mobility orientation is indicated by lower status youth (Slocum, 1956; Heller, 1967; Simmons and Rosenberg, 1971). Finally, although barriers to occupational opportunity are generally perceived, this is not taken into account in aspirations (Rosenberg and Simmons, 1971) or expectations (Ameen, 1968). For example, in a Mississippi study of black high school juniors and seniors in which 80 percent of the students perceived some barrier, over 91 percent of those aspiring to professional occupations expected to achieve them (Bell, 1969). Even when perception of structural and personal barriers has been shown to have a negative effect on achievement orientation, occupational aspirations, and occupational expectations, high levels of aspiration and expectation still persist (Aldrich, 1970).

HYPOTHETICAL MODEL

Cultural values are learned, intensified or modified, in the process of social interaction. Thus social and psychological factors are important in the process by which the individual acquires unique achievement values. This notion is conveyed more explicitly by the following theoretical assumptions related to the formation of aspirations.

(1) Significant others influence and status projections for the child and the child's perception of his mother's affective behavior constitute socialization factors serving to link socioeconomic background, mother's achievement values, and the child's measured intelligence with the child's status projections (after Strodtbeck, 1958; Simpson, 1962; Herriott, 1963; Rosen, 1964a; Sewell and Shah, 1967; Kandel and Lesser, 1969; Kandel, 1971).

(2) Child's self-concept and achievement motivation constitute personal factors serving to link socialization factors with the child's status projections (after McClelland, 1953; Elder, 1962; Rosen, 1964; Rosenberg, 1965; McCandless, 1967; Slocum, 1967).

Derived from the above theoretical assumptions concerning achievement orientation the following hypothetical sequence of variables is constructed.

Antecedent	Intervening		Dependent
Family structure			
	Mother's child-rearing value (orientations	Child's self-concept	
Family socioeconomic background			
	Child's perception of mother's affective behavior	Mother's status projections for child	Child's occupational and educational status projections
Mother's achievement orientations			
	Significant others influence	Child's academic motivation	
Child's measured intelligence and sibling order			

METHOD

Data Source

Data for this study came from an extensive questionnaire survey of 1412 lower social strata mother-child pairs in 1969. The design is purposive-quota sampling selecting racially homogeneous schools from rural districts (2,500 or less) that still have a substantial number of small farm population and from urban districts (above 40,000) composed of a large working-class population. Residential-racial subgroupings surveyed are (1) rural Appalachian white students (N=579) and their mothers (from Kentucky, Tennessee, and North Carolina); (2) rural black students (N=480) and their mothers (from Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina); and (3) urban black students (N=353) and their mothers (from Alabama, Kentucky, and Virginia). The child's questionnaire and the Otis-Lennon Intelligence Test were administered in group settings to all fifth and sixth graders in the schools selected. Interviews were then conducted with the students' mothers or mother substitutes by home visits. Subjects were deleted from the study when: (2) the child's IQ score was below 60; (b) data were incomplete; or (c) mother or mother substitute was lacking.

Measures of Variables

The following brief summary of operational definition of the variables is arranged in sequence from dependent to independent variables. Variables 3,6,9,10,11,12,13,14,17,18 are scales or subscales determined by factor analysis and the coefficient of reliability is an inter-item measure determined from the factor analysis procedure..

1. OCC — Child's occupational status projection - mean of aspired and expected - scored using NORC transformation of the Duncan Scale (Reiss, 1961:265-275)
2. ED — Child's educational status projection - mean of aspired and expected - 7 response categories "8th grade" to "finish college"
3. AC — Child's academic motivation - composite score on Elder Academic Motivation Scale (1962) and "liking school" subscale from Weiner Achievement Motivation Scale (unpublished). (Scale reliability = .74)
4. MOC — Mother's occupational status projection for child - parallels OCC
5. MED — Mother's educational status projection for child - parallels ED
6. SEL — Child's self-concept - score on Lipsett Self-Concept Scale for Children (1958) (Scale reliability = .88)
7. FATK — Child reports that father has talked with him or her about educational and occupational future - 2 items - responses to 10 categories "mother" to "no one"
8. MOTK — Child reports that mother has talked with him or her about educational and occupational future - parallels FATK
9. COM — Child's perception of mother's degree and type of communication - "with" rather than "to" the child, mother explains decisions, child involved in decision-making - scale derived from Elder's Independence Training Items (1962) (Scale reliability = .49)
10. PU — Child's perception of mother as "punishing" - punitive, rejection orientation - one of three subscales from the Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Inventory (Sigelman, 1965) (Scale reliability = .81)
11. DM — Child's perception of mother as "demanding" - insists on high achievement, withdraws affection when child misbehaves - BPB, Sigelman (1965) (Scale reliability = .75)
12. LV — Child's perception of mother as "loving" - affectionate, supportive, participatory orientation - BPB, Sigelman (1965) (Scale reliability = .81)
13. CHA — Mother desires child to have "character" - emphasis on success, self-control, individuality - based on 3 choices from 16 characteristics - Kohn Parental Values Items (1969)
14. OUT — Mother desires child to be "outgoing" - gregarious, happy, get along with others - Kohn (1969)
15. FST — Child is first born or only child
16. IQ — Child's score on the Otis-Lennon Mental Ability Test (1967) (Scale reliability = .70-.80)

17. ACV Mother's achievement value orientation (Rosen, 1964) (Scale reliability = .81)
18. ANO Mother's anomia (Srole, 1956) (Scale reliability = .65)
19. FBK Family background - designed to represent socioeconomic status through a weighted (to equalize standard deviations) combination of NORC occupational scores for father's occupation (or mother's if no husband) father's and mother's education, and mother's social participation
20. HOZ Household size
21. NOH No husband present
22. WEL Welfare status
23. MOG Mother's age

Procedure

Identification of the manner in which the variables influence aspiration is facilitated by regression analysis of our variables in a block-recursive design congruent with the "paths" of influence implied in the above hypothetical model.

In Duncan's (1966:1) discussion of path analysis in sociology, he points out that "path analysis focuses on the problem of interpretation and does not purport to be a method for discovering causes." Duncan points out that path analysis amounts to a sequence of conventional regression analyses, the path coefficients being "beta coefficients" in a regression setup. More specifically defined, path coefficients are quantities which indicate the fraction of the standard deviation of a dependent variable for which a designated independent variable is responsible (Land, 1969:8). That is to say, the path coefficient indicates the direct effect on one variable after the effects of all other antecedent variables have been controlled.

A concern with linear, additive, asymmetric relationships among a set of variables which are conceived as measurable on an interval scale is a

necessary assumption for the use of path analysis (Duncan, 1966:2-3). For this study these assumptions must be "relaxed" to a degree. All the variables are not at the interval level of measurement and in actuality interaction among certain variables must exist. For exploratory purposes and provided that caution is executed regarding the nature of conclusions reached these assumptions can be relaxed (Labovitz, 1967).

The merits of path analysis are: (1) it makes the theoretical assumptions of the ordering of variables explicit; (2) tends to force the discussion to be internally consistent; (3) enables criticism to be sharply focused and hence potentially relevant to the interpretation at hand and to the conduct of further inquiry; and (4) is presented in conjunction with causal diagrams that conveniently convey the relationships under consideration (Duncan, 1966:3, 7).

Much of the literature related to aspiration has yielded results based soley on zero order correlation; therefore, regression analysis may provide the capacity to clarify and interpret some previous findings.

FINDINGS

A brief descriptive profile of socioeconomic, demographic, and status projection characteristics is given in Table 1 indicating the disadvantaged nature and high status projections of the respondents.

The mean scores on the 23 variables by residential-racial subgrouping and by sex is shown in Table 2. Test of significance of the means reveals greater differences by sex in the dependent variables (upper part of chain) and greater differences by subgroupings in the independent variables.

A more important concern for this study is whether the regression coefficients for the subgroupings differ. Homogeneity tests were applied to

the 212 sets of three standardized regression coefficients for males and females. The tests led to rejection of the homogeneity hypothesis ($p < .05$) in only 13 cases for males and 14 cases for females. This is scarcely more than would be expected by chance, and while subgroup differences are of interest (see Table 3) analysis by sex is considered more important because of greater differences by sex.

Before moving to the regression analysis we would suggest that levels of significance should more properly be used as the basis of inference than the coefficients themselves. Most of the variables to be viewed as determinants of aspiration have fair amounts of measurement error which depress the apparent influence of the independent variables. This takes place in both the regression coefficient and the multiple correlation coefficient (see Cochran, 1970).

In order to ascertain the amount and type of influence of the variables on status projections a comparison of zero order correlation, partial correlation, partial regression, and standardized regression coefficients is presented (see Tables 1-4).

This procedure enables the identification of first, the "direct effects" of the antecedents upon the dependent variable (the standardized partial regression coefficients) having controlled for the effects of all other variables. The most significant of these coefficients, of course, is to be taken as our path indicators or paths of influence.

Secondly, the "indirect effects" of the antecedents (as indicated by the amount of "reduction" in the coefficients when moving from zero order correlations to standardized regression coefficients) are ascertained by tests of elaboration (spuriousness and mediation) and the "step-wise" regression procedure enables identification of the variables that account for the reduction.

For example, in the regression of OCC on all independent variables (Table 4) we find a spurious correlation of .075 drop to -.007 which is significant at the .05 level of probability and most of that is from .041 to -.008 or when block VI is included. Block VI is socialization variables that we will later see are determinants of SEL, thus the spurious correlation.

Antecedents of OCC

In our consideration of the influence of all the antecedent variables on OCC (see Tables 4 and 5) the most striking feature is the amount of reduction in moving from zero-order correlation to the fully adjusted regression coefficients. Note that 15 significant zero order correlation coefficients for males and 10 for females are reduced to only 5 significant regression coefficients. This amount of reduction indicates considerable interaction among the variables to produce spuriousness and mediation or indirect effects.

The variables with direct effect for males are MOC, MOTK, CHA, OUT, and to a lesser extent, DM. This is consistent with traditional literature that for youth, especially of lower social strata, upward mobility orientations are linked to maternal influence (Ellis and Lane, 1963). Perhaps more significant is the support for recent findings that suggest that measures of maternal influence such as mothers' expectations, aspirations, and encouragement are the main intervening factors explaining the indirect influence of other independent variables (Sewell and Shah, 1968; Kandel and Lesser, 1969; Kuvlesky, 1969; Rehberg, Schafer, and Sinclair, 1970). This is best seen in the tests of elaboration (see Tables 4a and 5a) which reveal that of the 4 variables with significant indirect effect (IQ,ACV, FBK, HOZ) MOC is the mediating variable in 3 cases.

For females MOC, and to a lesser extent CHA and OUT, are influential - but the role of the father's influence comes into play with FATK, rather than MOTK, being the significant source of influence. This finding is consistent with the contention that "the effect of parental intervention in the development of the child's achievement orientations is more frequently visible in the parent of the opposite sex" (Katrovsky, Preston, and Krandall, 1964). In view of father's influence on daughter's OCC it is curious to find that NOH has a positive direct effect that may be conjectured a mobility orientation "to compensate the consequences of structural incompleteness" (Kriesberg, 1967). Another curious finding is the relative lack of indirect effects, except that of IQ by way of MOC and COM.

Of special interest is the spuriousness in the association of AC, SEL, and ANO with OCC and relative modest indirect effects of IQ for both sexes on FBK for males only. This lends support to the position that occupational status projections are not contingent upon evaluative criteria. That is, occupational status projections for our respondents are little influenced by motivation, self-evaluation, and socioeconomic background, variables presumably determining occupational orientations as well as success.

Antecedents of ED

The amount of reduction is more profound in the antecedents of ED (Tables 6 and 7) than for OCC. Note that a very large number of significant zero order correlation coefficients are reduced to a mere handful of variables with direct effect. Furthermore, the variables with direct effect are reduced to a great extent indicating the amount of interaction among the variables.

In contrast with OCC the antecedents of ED are more congruent with previous findings in the literature. AC, MED, and IQ have direct effect for both sexes. As MOC mediated the influence of other variables to OCC, similarly MED is the main mediating variable in the sizable indirect effect of numerous variables on ED, especially for males (see Tables 6a, 7a, and 8).

As in the antecedents of OCC we find a contrasting pattern of indirect effects by sex. However, where indirect effects were sparse for females OCC in the case of ED significant indirect effects are pronounced and diffuse among numerous mediating variables (15) (see Table 8).

Another pronounced difference by sex is the extent to which FBK mediates the negative effects of family structure variables (MOG, WEL, and HOZ) for females but much less so for males. The direct effect of FBK on females ED consistent with other studies of rural southern youth (Sperry and Kivett, 1964) and raises the question of whether disadvantaged females are more likely to perceive or be influenced by barriers earlier than males.

By examining the final regression matrices for all variables (Tables 9 and 10) we see one of the most distinctive features of ED for both males and females is the very strong path of SEL AC ED. This is, of course, what would be predicted by previous literature on self-evaluation and achievement motivation (Hammond, 1954; Kohn, 1959; Komarovsky, 1962; McKinely, 1964; McCarthy and Yancy, 1971:659).

However, the strong antecedents of SEL in the variables LV, PU, DM were not found to indirectly influence ED through SEL AC in the tests of elaboration. Therefore the convenient "linking up" of variables by all significant beta values would be inconsistent with tests of elaboration.

CONCLUSIONS

Perhaps the most interesting finding in the consideration of the antecedents of OCC and ED is the apparently different sets of paths of influence for each. Whereas OCC for both sexes is primarily determined by a parallel measure for the mother (MOC), attitudinal measures of the mother (CHA,OUT) and significant other influence in the parent of the opposite sex, there is no influence from the child's variables AC and SEL.

In contrast ED for both sexes is strongly influenced not only by the child's AC, SEL, IQ but also by FBK and measures for the mother, MED and ACV. Furthermore the parent-child relationship variables (COM, LV, PU, DM) come into play with indirect effects indicating the possibility that socialization may have a greater influence on educational status projections than on occupational projections.

Thus, occupational and educational status projections, in this study, appear to have different paths of influence. Occupational status projections tends to be relatively independent of criteria determining life chances while educational projections are considerably more influenced by socioeconomic, ability, and self-evaluative factors.

This may have several important implications for an analytical distinction between occupational projections and educational projections. First, it raises the question about any attempt to treat occupational and educational status projections together as part of any constellation concept such as "ambition" (Turner, 1964).

Secondly, the more definitive antecedents of ED, coupled with greater explained variance (R^2 = .195 and .206 for male and female OCC; R^2 = .346 and .290 for male and female ED), and more anticipatory deflection in

educational expectations, possibly indicate less idealism in educational projections than in occupational projections.

The high amount of measurement error and low amount of explained variance in occupational status projections reflect the common problem of ineffective use of survey techniques with young and less educational respondents (TenHouten, et.al., 1971).

Perhaps a greater limitation is the possible exaggeration of the extent to which mobility orientations of the child (OCC and ED) are transmitted by parental influence (MOC, MED). As Furstenberg (1971) cautions, parental influence on aspiration is not only relatively modest but also parent-child agreement may result from common factors acting upon family members to produce similarity in aspirations.

The lack of ability in explaining status projections with numerous independent variables is far more than lack of precision in measurement and procedure. Not only does this short-coming call for more sophisticated analytical studies, but also calls for more sophisticated descriptive studies. For example, there is a need to ascertain the extent to which occupational projections are based on "prestige" or on the "monetary rewards" aspects of high status occupational responses. Finally, such qualitative dimensions of occupational status orientation such as individual "knowledge of occupations," "awareness of alternative occupations," and "intensity of aspiration," need more attention if investigators are to operationalize aspirations at the individual level of analysis rather than as a cultural or normative phenomenon.

Table 1. Brief Descriptive Profile

Socioeconomic and individual characteristics

Father's Occupational Status: mean NORC score = 53.0;
21.7 laborers, 21.5 no father or unemployed,
17.5% skilled craftsmen, 16.5 operators,
1.5 professional

Educational Status: father = 7.6 mean years;
mother = 8.9 mean years

Child's mean characteristics: age = 11.2; IQ = .87; FST = 28.2%
mid-sibling = 53.1%

Status Projections

	Male		Female	
	Asp	Exp	Asp	Exp
OCC -- mean NORC score	68.2	65.1	71.7	69.1
ED - mode "finish college"	56.0%	38.5%	63.9%	40.0%

Qualitative difference in OCC by sex

	Male			Female	
	Asp	Exp		Asp	Exp
1. Athlete	7.7	8.2	1. Teacher	39.5	30.5
2. Doctor	6.8	4.5	2. Nurse	21.1	16.5
3. Teacher	6.3	4.9	3. Secretary	10.4	8.5
	20.8%	17.6%		71.0%	55.5%

Comparison of S-63 with Wisconsin Study

The ED variable was scored 1 to 7. The Sewell, Haller, Ohlendorf (1970) LEA used scores of 0,1, and 2 for high school, vocational school and college. If we score S-63 categories 1-4 as 0, 5 and 6 as 1, and 7 as 2, then we can calculate an ED-LEA equivalent score for the groups. By fitting a line the conversion formula becomes: S-63 ED = 3.31 + 1.93 LEA. The Wisconsin total group had an average LEA of .833 which converted becomes a 4.92 ED score compared with 5.67 for all S-63 males.

Similarly, the Wisconsin LOA scores may be converted to scores comparable with S-63 OCC in accord with the formula: NORC = 54 + (.317) SES, where SES is Duncan's socioeconomic status score and NORC are the units of OCC in the present study. The formula was obtained by age fitting to Figure 1. of Reiss (1963:151). For Wisconsin,high school seniors the average OCC score would be 67 (converted from 40.429) while in S-63, the mean for all students was 68.8 (Source: Charles Proctor, Department of Experimental Statistics, North Carolina State University).

Table 2. Means for Variables by Sub-grouping and Sex

No.	Name	Sub-Group[a] UBB	UBG	RBB	RBG	RWB	RWG	F-values to test for SUB[b] Diff	SEX[c] Diff	ALL Mean (St. Dev.)
1	OCC	70	73	66	70	66	70	15.9	68.5	68.8 (± 9.4)
2	ED	6.0	6.2	5.6	5.7	5.4	5.5	27.5	3.9	5.67 (± 1.30)
3	AC	39	40	41	42	38	41	54.2	69.4	40.2 (± 4.1)
4	MED	5.6	5.6	5.5	5.6	5.6	5.4	1.1	0.0	5.53 (± 1.12)
5	MOC	74	72	68	71	69	70	33.7	6.3	70.5 (± 7.2)
6	SEL	67	70	67	69	65	67	11.7	19.4	67.2 (± 9.8)
7	FATK	1.2	.9	1.2	.9	1.3	1.0	4.2	53.0	1.11 (± .81)
8	MOTK	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.4	1.6	5.6	20.9	1.55 (± .62)
9	COM	3.4	3.4	3.1	3.2	3.7	4.0	39.3	3.2	3.50 (± 1.23)
10	PU	33	31	34	34	31	29	18.8	5.8	32.0 (± 9.9)
11	DM	53	54	52	53	50	52	12.4	17.0	52.1 (± 7.7)
12	LV	66	68	65	66	66	68	8.4	20.5	66.5 (± 7.4)
13	CHA	1.2	1.1	.8	.9	1.3	1.2	38.4	0.3	1.10 (± .74)
14	OUT	.9	.7	.9	.8	.9	.9	4.3	1.7	.87 (± .66)
15	FST	.21	.29	.23	.19	.37	.36	16.7	0.0	.283 (± .445)
16	IQ	88	89	79	79	92	95	261	5.9	87.4 (± 10.3)
17	ACM	28	27	23	24	26	26	76.6	1.2	25.5 (± 4.5)
18	ANO	.49	.55	.65	.66	.66	.64	10.6	0.2	.619 (± .460
19	FBK	143	139	120	119	132	129	112	4.9	129.5 (± 20.8)
20	HOZ	6.8	6.6	8.0	8.3	5.8	5.7	146	0.0	6.81 (± 2.30)
21	NOH	.27	.35	.23	.22	.06	.09	43.4	1.9	.185 (± .377)
22	WEL	.36	.49	.24	.45	.34	.45	.0.9	9.1	.382 (± .905)
23	MOG	38	38	40	40	38	38	9.2	0.0	38.5 (± 7.5)

[a] UBB = Urban black boys, UBG = Urban black girls, RBB = Rural black boys, RBG = Rural black girls, RWB = Rural white boys, RWG = Rural white girls.

[b] If there are no differences among sub-cultures this F statistic would exceed 4.6 1% of the time and 7.6 .05% of the time.

[c] If there is no boy-girl difference in means this F statistic would exceed 6.7 1% of the time and 12.2 .05% of the time.

Table 3. Tests of Homogeniety of Standardized Regression Coefficients: Significant Sub-Group Differences

Variables		Males UB	RB	RW	X^2	Variables		Females UB	RB	RW	X^2
OCC	on HOZ	-19	-04	06	6.02*	OCC	on MOTK	19	-10	-07	7.89*
ED	on WEL	02	10	-10	6.34*	ED	on HOZ	-26	03	-09	8.27*
	on LV	-15	17	08	6.36*		on FBK	33	09	03	7.49*
	on COM	12	01	-16	8.91*		on MED	-05	15	28	8.64*
	on SEL	22	-07	01	6.47*	AC	on COM	21	09	-11	12.16**
AC	on PU	-13	08	11	7.39*		on FATK	03	-08	20	10.60**
MED	on FBK	06	15	35	9.09*	MOC	on WEL	04	04	-19	7.61*
FATK	on CHA	-08	08	-16	6.47*	MOTK	on WEL	18	01	-22	14.48**
DM	on MOG	-08	05	-19	6.40*	FATK	on WEL	20	-04	-07	7.15*
PU	on HOZ	13	-09	17	9.08*	CHA	on ANO	-13	-14	12	7.28*
	on FBK	00	-12	15	6.25*	IQ	on FBK	01	17	40	18.16**
OUT	on NOH	14	-14	08	8.05*		on ACV	16	32	05	5.97*
ACV	on WEL	21	-04	-26	6.68*	FBK	on NOH	12	-13	10	7.60*
						ACV	on MOG	-13	-04	-28	9.44**

** = p <.005
** = p >.006 <.01
* = p > .02 <.05

Table 4. Step-Wise Regression of Male Occupational Status Projection (OCC) on Independent Variables

Independent Variables		Zero Order r	Step-wise inclusion of blocks: X	IX	VIII	VII	VI	V	IV	III	II
Blocks											
II	3 AC	.092*	.089	.076	.061	.066	.022	.017	.020	.020	.023
III	4 MED	.176**	.166	.114	.095	.084	.087	.089	.090	.058	.056
	5 MOC	.228**	.227	.191	.176	.175	.172	.172	.172	.171	.172**
IV	6 SEL	.075*	.071	.059	.045	.041	-.008	-.007	-.008	-.007	-.014
V	7 FATK	.021	.020	.013	.004	.008	-.016	-.043	-.042	-.043	-.043
	8 MOTK	.134**	.132	.120	.105	.105	.081	.093	.093	.092	.090**
VI	9 COM	.106**	.098	.101	.087	.076	.034	.029	.029	.028	.026
	10 PU	.000	.004	.010	.023	.017	-.017	-.023	-.025	-.015	-.016
	11 DM	.111**	.107	.107	.110	.108	.083	.084	.085	.085	.082+
	12 LV	.107**	.102	.097	.088	.092	.035	.023	.025	.018	.017
VII	13 CHA	.082*	.080	.067	.064	.139	.138	.136	.136	.130	.131**
	14 OUT	.097**	.100	.081	.083	.146	.141	.140	.140	.130	.131**
VIII	15 FST	.071	.047	.064	.073	.077	.078	.073	.073	.063	.062
	16 IQ	.160**	.153	.106	.131	.125	.114	.105	.106	.070	.068
IX	17 ACV	.136**	.133	.090	.084	.065	.050	.047	.047	.025	.026
	18 ANO	-.108**	-.109	-.045	-.036	-.032	-.036	-.037	-.037	-.030	-.029
	19 FBK	.137**	.132	.104	.073	.054	.065	.063	.063	.012	.012
X	20 HOZ	-.079*	-.082	-.069	-.029	-.035	-.019	-.020	-.020	-.015	-.015
	21 NOH	.003	-.002	.006	.013	.007	.002	-.009	-.009	-.001	.000
	22 WEL	-.036	-.030	-.001	.005	.004	-.003	-.003	-.002	.000	-.001
	23 MOG	.011	.008	.042	.057	.049	.057	.057	.057	.062	.063

Partial correlation coefficients above diagonal; differences indicate spuriousness or masking.
Standardized regression coefficients below diagonal; differences indicate mediation effect.
Differences between adjacent r's and b's on the diagonal indicate interaction among variables in same block.

** = $p < .005$
** = $p > .006 < .01$
* = $p > .02 < .05$
+ = $p > .06 < .10$

Table 4a. Tests of Elaboration: Antecedents of Male Occupational Status Projection (OCC)

TEST		REDUCTION	INTERPRETATION
r1,3=.089	r1,3·4-23=.035	-.054+	spurious
	b1,3·4-23=.040	+.005	
r1,4=.083	r1,4·6-23=.030	-.053+ (-.034 via block IX)	spuriousness
	b1,4·5-23=-.006	-.036	interaction
	b1,4·3-23=-.009	-.003	
r1,5=.179	r1,5·6-23=.147	-.032	
	b1,5·4-23=.154	+.007	
	b1,5·3-23=.152	-.002	direct effect
r1,6=.070	r1,6·7-23=.053	-.017	spuriousness
	b1,6·8-23=.056	+.003	
	b1,6·3-23=.044	-.012	
r1,7=.094	r1,7·9-23=.103	+.009	
	b1,7·8-23=.122	+.019	
	b1,7·3-23=.120	-.002	direct effect
r1,9=.094	r1,9·13-23=.077	-.022 (-.015 block VIII)	
	b1,9·10-23=.068	-.009	
	b1,9·3-23=.062	-.006	
r1,13=.053	r1,13·15-23=.040	-.013	
	b1,13·14-23=.079	+.039	masking
	b1,13·3-23=.080	+.001	direct effect
r1,14=.063	r1,14·15-23=.047	-.016	
	b1,14·13-23=.083	+.036	masking
	b1,14·3-23=.085	+.002	direct effect
r1,15=.087	r1,15·17-23=.103	+.016	masking
	b1,15·16-23=.108	+.005	
	b1,15·3-23=.092	-.016	direct effect
r1,16=.109	r1,16·17-23=.081	-.028 (-.029 via block IX)	
	b1,16·15-23=.098	+.017*	
	b1,16·3-23=.023	-.075* (-.018 block VI, -.034 block III)	mediation indirect effect
r1,19=.103	r1,19·20-23=.103	.000	
	b1,19·17-23=.109	+.006	
	b1,19·3-23=.078	-.031	
r1,21=.042	r1,21·20-23=.054	+.012	masking
	b1,21·3-23=.100	+.046 (+.036 block V)	direct effect

Levels of significance for reduction:

** = $p < .002$ ** = $p < .02$ * = $p < .05$ + = $p < .10$

Table 5. Step-Wise Regression of Female Occupational Status Projection (OCC) on Independent Variables

Independent Variables		Zero Order r	Step-wise inclusion of blocks X	IX	VIII	VII	VI	V	IV	III	II
Blocks											
II	3 AC	.089*	.088	.086	.079	.082	.063	.056	.042	.035	.040
III	4 MED	.083*	.079	.045	.034	.082	.037	.032	.030	-.006	-.009
	5 MOC	.179**	.178	.169	.150	.148	.147	.148	.147	.154	.152**
IV	6 SEL	.070+	.073	.072	.067	.072	.055	.053	.056	.055	.044
V	7 FATK	.094*	.108	.107	.106	.109	.103	.122	.120	.122	.120**
	8 MOTK	-.008	-.011	-.012	-.009	-.008	-.029	-.066	-.067	-.058	-.059
VI	9 COM	.094*	.097	.089	.074	.077	.068	.071	.067	.065	.062
	10 PU	.004	.004	.002	.007	-.004	.001	-.007	.010	.010	.012
	11 DM	.036	.038	.038	.043	.040	.006	.011	.001	.001	-.003
	12 LV	.050	.052	.047	.047	.048	.017	.014	.004	-.002	-.006
VII	13 CHA	.053	.051	.050	.040	.079	.082	.086	.087	.080	.080+
	14 OUT	.063+	.067	.048	.047	.083	.083	.087	.087	.085	.085*
VIII	15 FST	.087*	.096	.103	.108	.105	.105	.105	.103	.091	.092*
	16 IQ	.109**	.110	.081	.098	.088	.070	.061	.061	.027	.023
IX	17 ACV	.054	.054	.031	.026	.009	.004	.009	.005	.006	.007
	18 ANO	-.016	-.015	.031	.035	.039	.038	.040	.038	.035	.033
	19 FBK	.103**	.103	.109	.089	.082	.083	.031	.083	.078	.078
X	20 HOZ	-.009	.000	.014	.068	.061	.066	.067	.071	.067	.063
	21 NOH	.042	.054	.051	.063	.064	.068	.104	.106	.102	.100*
	22 WEL	-.009	-.028	-.012	-.010	-.013	-.015	-.019	-.018	-.013	-.010
	23 MOG	-.007	-.009	.015	.045	.040	.036	.040	.040	.039	.041

Partial correlation coefficients above diagonal; differences indicate spuriousness or masking.
Standardized regression coefficients below diagonal; differences indicate mediation effect.
Differences between adjacent r's and b's on the diagonal indicate interaction among variables in same block.

** = $p < .005$
** = $p > .006 < .01$
* = $p > .02 < .05$
+ = $p > .06 < .10$

Table 5a. Tests of Elaboration: Antecedents of Female Occupational Status Projection (OCC)

TEST		REDUCTION	INTERPRETATION
r1,3=.092	r1,3·4-23=.020	-.072* (-.044 via block VI)	spuriousness
r1,4=.176	r1,4·6-23=.090	-.086** (-.052 via block IX)	spuriousness
	b1,4·3-23=.058	-.032 (via block III)	interaction
r1,5=.288	r1,5·6-23=.172	-.064+ (-.036 via block IX)	spuriousness
	b1,5·4-23=.171	-.001	direct effect
r1,6=.075	r1,6·7-23=-.007	-.082* (-.049 via block VI)	spuriousness
r1,8=.134	r1,8·9-23=.081	-.053+ (-.024 via block VI)	
	b1,8·7-23=.093	+.012	direct effect
r1,9=.106	r1,9·13-23=.076	-.030	
	b1,9·10-23=.034	-.042 (via biock VI)	interaction
r1,11=.111	r1,11·13-23=.108	-.003	
	b1,11·9-23=.083	-.025	
	b1,11·3-23=.082	-.001	direct effect
r1,12=.107	r1,12·13-23=.092	-.015	
	b1,12·9-23=.035	-.057+ (via block VI)	interaction
r1,13=.082	r1,13·15-23=.064	-.018	
	b1,13·14-23=.139	+.075* (via block VII)	masking
	b1,13·3-23=.131	-.008	direct effect
r1,14=.097	r1,14·15-23=.083	-.014	
	b1,14·13-23=.146	+.063+ (via block VII)	masking
	b1,14·3-23=.131	-.015	direct effect
r1,16=.160	r1,16·17-23=.106	-.054+ (-.047 via block IX)	spuriousness
	b1,16·15-23=.131	+.025	
	b1,16·3-23=.068	-.059+ (-.036 via block III)	mediation indirect effect
r1,17=.136	r1,17·20-23=.133	-.003	
	b1,17·18-23=.090	-.043 via block IX)	interaction
	b1,17·3-23=.026	-.064+ (-.022 block III)	mediation indirect effect
r1,18=-.108	r1,18·20-23=.109	+.001	
	b1,18·17-23=-.045	-.064+ (via block IX)	interaction
	b1,18·3-23=-.029	-.016	
r1,19=.137	r1,19·20-23=.132	-.005	
	b1,19:17-23=.104	-.028	
	b1,19·3-23=.012	-.092** (-.082 via blocks III and VIII)	mediation indirect effect
r1,20=-.079	b1,20·21-23=-.082	+.003	
	b1,20·3-23=-.015	-.067* (-.040 via block VIII)	mediation indirect effect

Levels of significance for reduction

** = $p < .002$ ** = $p < .02$ * = $p < .05$ += $p < .10$

Table 6. Step-Wise Regression of Male Educational Status Projection (ED) on Independent Variables

Independent Variables		Zero Order r	Step-wise inclusion of blocks X	IX	VIII	VII	VI	V	IV	III	II
Blocks											
II	3 AC	.351**	.347	.338	.313	.315	.270	.266	.244	.237	.260**
III	4 MED	.290**	.271	.210	.179	.175	.180	.180	.175	.160	.135**
	5 MOC	.212**	.200	.141	.114	.114	.110	.110	.114	.078	.089*
IV	6 SEL	.227**	.226	.215	.187	.186	.128	.112	.117	.110	.029
V	7 FATK	.180**	.164	.160	.154	.155	.122	.121	.105	.103	.103**
	8 MOTK	.100**	.099	.084	.060	.060	.014	-.020	-.023	-.021	-.038
VI	9 COM	.105**	.101	.110	.080	.076	-.009	-.015	-.024	-.024	-.041
	10 PU	.008	.009	.018	.048	.046	.003	.005	.030	.030	.023
	11 DM	.150**	.147	.151	.162	.161	.090	.083	.070	.079	.044
	12 LV	.195**	.192	.193	.173	.175	.119	.107	.071	.065	.046
VII	13 CHA	.054	.055	.039	.040	.054	.057	.060	.057	.039	.053
	14 OUT	.050	.051	.022	.022	.046	.046	.050	.044	.032	.045
VIII	15 FST	.035	-.011	.006	.011	.012	.014	.007	.011	.001	.004
	16 IQ	.283**	.271	.216	.254	.252	.240	.239	.227	.187	.159**
IX	17 ACV	.164**	.140	.066	.042	.035	.008	.009	.013	-.015	-.005
	18 ANO	-.119**	-.111	-.033	-.014	-.013	-.022	-.016	-.015	-.003	.004
	19 FBK	.230**	.202	.187	.126	.120	.133	.132	.127	.074	.070
X	20 HOZ	-.047	-.054	-.033	-.016	-.017	-.004	-.007	-.005	.010	.010
	21 NOH	-.065+	-.045	-.035	-.029	-.030	-.041	-.008	-.007	.004	.010
	22 WEL	-.105**	-.084	-.047	-.042	-.042	-.040	-.037	-.042	-.037	-.040
	23 MOG	-.070+	-.068	-.020	-.028	-.031	-.022	-.021	-.022	-.021	-.006

Partial correlation coefficients above diagonal; differences indicate spuriousness or masking.
Standardized regression coefficients below diagonal; differences indicate mediation effect.
Differences between adjacent r's and b's on the diagonal indicate interaction among variables in same block.

** = $p < .005$
** = $p > .006 < .01$
* = $p > .02 < .05$
+ = $p > .06 < .10$

Table 6a. Tests of Elaboration: Antecedents of Male Educational Status Projection (ED)

TEST		REDUCTION	INTERPRETATION
r2,3=.351	r2,3·4-23=.237	-.114** (-.045 via block VI)	spuriousness
	b2,3·4-23=.260	+.023	direct effect
r2,4=.290	r2,4·6-23=.175	-.115** (-.061 via block IX, .031 block VIII)	spuriousness
	b2,4·5-23=.160	-.015	
	b2,4·3-23=.135	-.025	direct effect
r2,5=.212	r2,5·6-23=.114	-.098** (-.059 block IX, .027 block VIII)	spuriousness
	b2,5·4-23=.078	-.036	
	b2,5·3-23=.089	+.011	direct effect
r2,6=.227	r2,6·7-23=.112	-.114** (-.028 block VIII, .058 block VI)	spuriousness
	b2,6·3-23=.029	-.088** (-.081 block II)	mediation indirect effect
r2,7=.180	r2,7·9-23=.122	-.058+ (-.033 block VI)	
	b2,7·8-23=.121	-.001	
	b2,7·3-23=.103	-.018	direct effect
r2,8=.100	r2,8·9-23=.014	-.086** (-.046 block VI)	spuriousness
	b2,8·7-23=-.020	-.034	
	b2,8·3-23=-.038	-.018	
r2,9=.105	r2,9·13-23=.076	-.029	
	b2,9·10-23=.099	-.067* (via block VI)	interaction
	b2,9·2-23=-.041	-.050	
r2,11=.150	r2,11·13-23=.161	+.011	
	b2,11·9-23=.090	-.071* (via block VI)	interaction
	b2,11·3-23=.044		
r2,12=.195	r2,12·13-23=.175	-.020	
	b2,12·9-23=.119	-.051 (via block VI)	interaction
	b2,12·3-23=.046	-.065+ (-.036 block IV)	
r2,16=.283	r2,16·17-23=.216	-.067* (-.045 block IX)	spuriousness
	b2,16·15-23=.250	+.035 (block VIII)	interaction
	b2,16·3-23=.159	-.091 (-.040 block III, -.028)	mediation, indirect effect, direct effect

(Continued)

(Table 6a. Continued)

r2,17=.164	r2,17·20-23=.140	-.024	
	b2,17·18-23=.066	-.074* (block IX)	interaction
	b2,17·3-23=-.005	-.071* (-.028 VI, -.028 block III)	mediation indirect effect
r2,18=-.119	r2,18·20-23=-.111	-.008	
	b2,18·17-23=-.033	-.078* (block IX)	interaction
	b2,18·3-23=.004	+.037	
r2,19=.230	r2,19·20-23=.202	-.028	
	b2,19·17-23=.187	-.015	
	b2,19·3-23=.070	-.117** (-.061, block VIII, -.053, block III)	mediation indirect effect
r2,21=-.065	r2,21·20-23=-.045	-.020	interaction
	b2,21·3-23=.010	+.050	
r2,22=-.105	r2,23·20-23=-.084	-.021	interaction
	b2,23·3-23=-.040	-.044 (-.037 block IX)	mediation
r2,23=-.070	r2,23·20-22=-.068	-.002	
	b2,23·2-23=-.006	-.064+ (-.048 via block IX)	mediation

Levels of significance for reduction:

** = $p < .002$ ** = $p < .02$ * = $p < .05$ + = $p < .10$

Table 7. Step-Wise Regression of Female Educational Status Projection (ED) on Independent Variables

Independent Variables		Zero Order r	Step-wise inclusion of blocks								
Blocks			X	IX	VIII	VII	VI	V	IV	III	II
II	3 AC	.198***	.196	.201	.187	.187	.160	.157	.132	.117	.127**
III	4 MED	.302**	.274	.204	.190	.192	.199	.196	.194	.187	.179**
	5 MOC	.147**	.136	.114	.090	.091	.089	.092	.091	.046	.042
IV	6 SEL	.162**	.152	.154	.152	.151	.110	.109	.112	.105	.070+
V	7 FATK	.045	.047	.046	.044	.044	.041	.032	.029	.019	.011
	8 MOTK	.053	.041	.042	.052	.052	.032	.020	.017	.012	.010
VI	9 COM	.147**	.142	.125	.099	.098	.077	.074	.067	.077	.067+
	10 PU	-.098**	-.093	-.099	-.094	-.094	-.096	-.099	-.067	-.065	-.059
	11 DM	.037	.047	.046	.050	.048	.042	.042	.021	.032	.019
	12 LV	.086*	.080	.067	.058	.057	-.006	-.015	-.035	-.038	-.054
VII	13 CHA	-.011	-.005	-.015	-.024	-.020	-.006	-.005	-.002	-.015	-.015
	14 OUT	.077*	.075	.021	.016	.006	.017	.018	.019	.017	.019
VIII	15 FST	.029	-.048	-.033	-.039	-.038	-.040	-.041	-.046	-.051	-.050
	16 IQ	.248**	.224	.149	.183	.184	.160	.162	.161	.123	.112**
IX	17 ACV	.198**	.169	.082	.054	.056	.049	.049	.040	.031	.036
	18 ANO	-.136**	-.116	-.011	-.009	-.009	-.006	-.000	-.011	-.016	.022
	19 FBK	.277**	.246	.227	.184	.182	.186	.185	.188	.127	.129**
X	20 HOZ	-.140**	-.147	-.110	-.111	-.108	-.097	-.095	-.088	-.078	-.090*
	21 NOH	.034	.049	.045	.045	.047	.052	.059	.064	.048	.040
	22 WEL	-.065+	-.076	-.031	-.025	-.026	-.030	-.029	-.026	-.011	-.003
	23 MOG	.086*	.088	.030	.043	.043	.054	.053	.053	.048	.040

Partial correlation coefficients above diagonal; differences indicate spuriousness or masking.
Standardized regression coefficients below diagonal; differences indicate mediation effort.
Differences between adjacent r's and b's on the diagonal indicate interaction among variables in same block

*** = $p < .005$
** = $p > .006$ $< .01$
* = $p > .02$ $< .05$
+ = $p > .06$ $< .10$

Table 7a. Tests of Elaboration: Antecedents of Female Educational Status Projection (ED)

TEST		REDUCTION	INTERPRETATION
r2,3=.198	r2,3·4-23=.117	-.082** (-.027 block VI, -.025 IV)	spuriousness
	ba,3·4-23=.127	+.010	direct effect
r2,4=.302	r2,4·6-23=.194	-.108** (-.028, block X, -.070 block IX)	spuriousness
	b2,4·5-23=.187	-.007	
	b2,4·3-23=.179	-.008	direct effect
r2,5=.147	r2,5·6-23=.091	-.056+ (-.022 block IX, -.024 block VIII)	spuriousness
	b2,5·4-23=.046	-.045 (block III)	interaction
	b2,5·3-32=.042	-.002	
r2,6=.162	r2,6·7-23=.109	-.053+ (-.041 block VI)	spuriousness
	b2,6·7-23=.112		
	b2,6·3-32=.070	-.042 (-.035 block II)	mediation indirect effect
r2,9-.147	r2,9·13-23=.098	-.049	
	b2,9·10-23=.077	-.021	
	b2,9·3-23=.067	-.010	direct effect
r2,10=-.098	r2,10·13-23=-.094	-.004	
	b2,10·9-23=-.096	+.002	
	b2,10·3-23=-.059	-.037 (-.032 block IV)	mediation indirect effect
r2,12=.086	r2,12·13-23=.057	-.029	
	b2,12·9-23=-.006	-.063+ (block VI)	interaction
	b2,12·3-23=-.054	-.048 (-.020 block V)	
r2,14=.077	r2,14·15-23=.016	-.061+ (-.054 block IX)	spuriousness
	b2,14·13-23=.006	-.010	
	b2,14·3-23=.019	+.013	
r2,16=.248	r2,16·17-23=.149	-.099** (-.075 block IX)	spuriousness
	b2,16·15-23=.183	+.032*	interaction
	b2,16·3-23=.112	-.072* (-.024 block VI, -.038 block III)	indirect effect direct effect
r2,17=.198	r2,17·20-23=.169	-.029	
	b2,17·18-23=.082	-.087**	interaction
	b2,17·3-32=.036	-.046 (-.028 block VIII)	mediation indirect effect

(Continued)

(Table 7a. Continued)

r2,18=.136	r2,18·20-23=-.116	-.020	
	b2,18·17-23=-.001	-.105**	interaction
	b2,18·3-23=-.022	+.011	
r2,19=.277	r2,19·20-23=.246	-.031	
	b2,19·17-23=.227	-.019	
	b2,19·3-23=.129	-.098** (-.043 block VIII, -.061 block III)	mediation indirect effect
r2,20=-.140	b2,20·21-23=-.147	+.007	
	b2,20·3-23=-.090	-.057+ (-.037 block IX)	mediation indirect effect direct effect
r2,22=-.065	b2,22·20-23=-.076	+.011	
	b2,22·3-23=-.003	-.073* (-.045 block IX)	mediation indirect effect
r2,23=-.086	b2,22·20-22=-.088	+.002	
	b2,22·3-23=-.040	-.044 (-.044 (-.058+ block IX)	mediation indirect effect

Level of significance for reduction:

*** = $p < .002$ ** = $p < .02$ * = $p < .05$ + = $p < .10$

Table 8.
Summary of Significant Antecedents
of
Occupational (OCC) and Educational (ED)
Status Projections

	Males		Females	
	direct effects	indirect effects	direct effects	indirect effects
OCC				
	MOC	IQ via MOC	MOC	IQ via MOC, COM
	MOTK	ACV via MOC	FATK	
	CHA	FBK via MOC, IQ	CHA	
	OUT	HOZ via FST	OUT	
	DM		FST	
			NOH	
ED				
	AC	SEL via AC	AC	SEL via AC
	MED	IQ via MED	MED	PU via SEL
	MOC	ACV via MED, DM	COM	IQ via MED, COM
	FATK	FBK via COM, LV, MED	IQ	ACV via IQ
	IQ	HOZ via FBK	FBK	FBK via IQ, MED
				HOZ via FBK, ACV, ANO
				WEL via FBK, ANO, ACV
				MOG via FBK, ACV

Table 9. Standardized Regression Coefficients for Males

Dependent Variables	Independent Variables 2 ED	3 AC	4 MED	5 MOC	6 SEL	7 FATK	8 MOTK	9 COM	10 PU	11 DM	12 LV
1 OCC	(15*)	02	06	17*	-01	-04	09+	03	-02	08	02
2 ED		26*	14*	09+	03	10*	-04	-04	02	04	05
3 AC			10+	-04	31*	00	06	07	03	13*	07
4 MED				(23*)	06	01	-02	-01	03	-06	02
5 MOC					-03	01	02	01	-07	02	03
6 SEL						14*	02	08+	-21*	11+	31*
7 FATK							(28*)	06	00	06	13*
8 MOTK								09+	07	01	20*
9 COM									(04)	(33*)	(41*)
10 PU										(36*)	(06)
11 DM											(52*)
12 LV											
13 CHA											
14 OUT											
15 FST											
16 IQ											
17 ACV											
18 ANO											
19 FBK											

Partial correlation coefficients in parentheses.

* = $p < .005$
+ = $p > .006$ $< .05$

Table 9. Continued

Dependent Variables	13 CHA	14 OUT	15 FST	16 IQ	17 ACV	18 ANO	19 FBK	20 HOZ	21 NOH	22 WEL	23 MOG
	Independent Variables										
1 OCC	13*	13*	06	07	03	-03	01	-02	00	-00	06
2 ED	05	05	00	16*	-01	00	07	01	01	-04	-01
3 AC	-05	-05	-01	11+	-04	-03	01	00	-02	01	-06
4 MED	12*	05	04	18*	14+	-07	23*	-10+	-05	-03	00
5 MOC	-00	04	05	14*	08	-02	22*	01	-03	-00	-03
6 SEL	03	05	-04	10+	-03	-00	05	-01	-00	04	01
7 FATK	-02	-04	08	03	-00	-05	01	03	-27*	-01	-01
8 MOTK	01	-00	08+	11+	03	-01	04	01	-00	06	-00
9 COM	04	11+	-01	19+	04	00	-15*	-18*	-03	05	-06
10 PU	02	07	03	-17*	-03	-03	01	07	08	-04	-05
11 DM	02	03	02	-04	09+	02	-04	-07	07	-02	-07
12 LV	-04	-01	-04	16*	15*	06	-09	-08	02	-01	-03
13 CHA		(-49*)	-00	04*	17*	08	01	01	01	-01	09+
14 OUT			-03	00	-03	-11+	12+	03	03	02	-03
15 FST				(-02)	-09	02	-01	-45*	-05	-04	-28*
16 IQ					09+	-08+	24*	-05	-02	-02	04
17 ACV						(-52*)	(37*)	-02	-01	-16*	-12+
18 ANO							(-28*)	00	07	02	05
19 FBK								-11*	-04	-14*	-20+

Partial correlation coefficients in parentheses.

* = $p \leq .005$
+ = $p > .006$ $< .05$

Table 10. Standardized Regression Coefficients for Females

Dependent Variables	Independent Variables 2 ED	3 AC	4 MED	5 MOC	6 SEL	7 FATK	8 MOTK	9 COM	10 PU	11 DM	12 LV
1 OCC	(17*)	04	-01	15*	04	12*	-06	06	01	-00	-01
2 ED		13+	18+	04	07	01	01	07	-06	02	-05
3 AC			06	03	28*	07	02	08+	-05	10+	12*
4 MED				(25*)	03	05	04	-06	-01	-06	01
5 MOC					01	-01	-06	01	-01	-00	04
6 SEL						03	03	06	-29*	19*	18*
7 FATK							(30*)	03	06	-02	14*
8 MOTK								10+	02	03	22*
9 COM									(-05)	(35*)	(39*)
10 PU										(21*)	(-06)
11 DM											(56*)
12 LV											
13 CHA											
14 OUT											
15 FST											
16 IQ											
17 ACV											
18 ANO											
19 FBK											

Partial correlation coefficients in parentheses.

* = $p < .005$
+ = $p > .006$ $< .05$

Table 10. Continued

Dependent Variables	Independent Variables 13 CHA	14 OUT	15 FST	16 IQ	17 ACV	18 ANO	19 FBK	20 HOZ	21 NOH	22 WEL	23 MOG
1 OCC	08	09+	09+	02	01	03	08	06	10+	-01	04
2 ED	-01	02	-05	11+	04	-02	13*	-09+	04	-00	-04
3 AC	-00	-02	-02	09+	-04	04	-02	09+	06	-06	-06
4 MED	05	01	01	15*	05	02	32*	-06	08	-07	-03
5 MOC	05	02	08	23*	-00	02	05	02	03	04	00
6 SEL	-03	-01	04	01	08	04	-03	-06	-04	-02	00
7 FATK	-03	-04	02	01	-02	01	03	-02	-26*	00	-04
8 MOTK	-00	-02	03	-11+	05	05	00	-03	07	-05	-02
9 COM	-03	-02	01	25*	07	01	-02	-05	-05	01	06
10 PU	12+	13*	-02	-07	01	05	01	09+	01	-00	-09+
11 DM	-01	08+	-03	-04	06	03	-02	02	-03	08	-04
12 LV	-06	04	-04	07	01	-02	02	-07	-05	04	-02
13 CHA		(-47*)	04	09	11+	-01	-06	11+	08	-02	02
14 OUT			-01	04	11+	-04	14*	-03	-08	06	04
15 FST				(03)	12+	-01	-04	08+	07	-03	01
16 IQ					13*	-02	23*	-09+	-02	-03	01
17 ACV						(-54*)	(42*)	-11*	-02	-10+	-14*
18 ANO							(-31*)	08+	03	12*	06
19 FBK								-12*	02	-16*	-20*

Partial correlation coefficients in parentheses.

* = $p < .005$
+ = $p > .006$ $< .05$

REFERENCES CITED

Aldrich, Bruce W.
1970 "Social origins, personality, and anticipated occupational status: a study of levels of occupational aspiration and expectation among adolescent males." Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.

Ameen, Bilquis A.
1968 "Occupational status orientations and perception of opportunity: a racial comparison of rural youth from depressed areas." College Station: Texas A&M University, unpublished Master's thesis.

Antonovsky, A. and M. J Lerner
1959 "Occupational aspirations of lower class Negro and white youth." Social Problems 7 (Fall); 132-138.

Bell, Jimmy L.
1969 "Orientations and perceptions of blocks and barriers to educationa and occupational goals of Negro high school youth of Sunflower County, Mississippi." State College: Mississippi State University, unpublished Master's thesis.

Brim, Orville G.
1965 "Adolescen: personality as self-other systems." Journal of Marriage aid the Family 27 (May); 156-162.

Cochran, W. G.
1970 "Some effects of errors of measurement on multiple correlation." Journal of the American Statistical Association 65: 22-34.

Coleman, James, Ernest Q. Campbell, Carol J. Hobson, James McPartland, Alesancer M. Mood, Frederic D. Weinfeld, and Robert L. York
1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.

Cosby, Arthur and J. Steve Picou
1971 "Vocational expectations of adolescents in four-deep South states." Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 177-182.

Duncan, Otis D.
1966 "Path analysis: some sociological examples." American Journal of Sociology 72 (July); 1-16.

Elder, Glen H.
1962 Adolescent Achievement and Mobility Aspirations. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.

Empy, L. T.
1956 "Social class and occupational aspiration: a comparison of absolute and relative measurement." American Sociological Review 21 (December); 703-709.

Furstenberg, Frank F., Jr.
1971 "The transmission of mobility orientation in the family." Social Forces 29, 595-603.

Gist, N. P. and W. S. Bennett
1963 "Aspirations of Negro and white students." Social Forces 42 (October); 40-48.

Haller, Archibald O.
1968 "On the concept aspiration." Rural Sociology 33 (December); 484-486.

Haller, Archibald O. and Irwin W. Miller
1967 The Occupational Aspiration Scale: Theory, Structure and Correlated. Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Han, Wan Sang
1969 "Two conflicting themes: common values versus class differential values." American Sociological Review 34 (October); 679-689.

Hamilton, Richard R.
1964 "The behavior and values of skilled workers," in William Gomberg and Arthur Shostack (eds.), Blue Collar World. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Hammond, S. B.
1954 "Class and family." Pp. 238-248 in Ceser and Hammond (eds.), Social Structure and Personality in a City. London: Routledge Kegan.

Heller, Celia S.
1967 "Class as an explanation of ethnic differences in mobility aspirations." Internal Migration Review 2,31-37.

Herriott, Robert E.
1963 "Some social determinants of educational aspiration." Harvard Educational Review 33 (Spring); 157-177.

Kandel, Denise B.
1971 "Race maternal authority, and adolescent aspirations." American Journal of Sociology 76 (May); 999-1020.

Kandel, Denise B. and Gerald S. Lesser
1969 "Parental and peer influences on educational plans of adolescents." American Sociological Review 34 (April); 213-223.

Katkovsky, W., Anne Preston, and V. J. Crandall
1964 "Parents' attitudes toward their personal achievements and toward the achievement behaviors of their children." Journal of Genetic Psychology 104; 67-82.

Kohn, Melvin L.
1959a "Social class and the exercise of parental authority." American Sociological Review 24 (June); 352-366.

1959b "Social class and parental values." American Journal of Sociology 64 (January); 337-351.

1969 "Class and conformity: study in values." Homewood, Illinois.

Komarovsky, Mirra
1962 Blue Collar Marriage. New York: Random House.

Kriesberg, Louis
1967 "Rearing children for educational achievement in fatherless families." Journal of Marriage and the Family 29; 288-301.

Kuvlesky, William P.
1969 "A synthetic overview of research on rural youth's projections for occupational and educational attainment: a progress report." Paper presented to the Rural Sociological Society's Research Committee on Education and Occupational Behavior. San Francisco.

Labovitz, Stanford
1967 "Some observations on measurement and statistics." Social Forces 46 (December); 151-160.

Land, Kenneth C.
1968 "Principles of path analysis." Pp. 3-37 in Edgar F. Borgatta (ed.), Sociological Methodology, 1969. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lever, Michael F.
1969 "Selected occupational status projections of Southern youth: an analysis by sex, race, and socioeconomic status." College Station: Texas A&M University, unpublished Master's thesis.

Lipsett, L. P.
1958 "A self-concept scale for children and its relationship to the Children's Form of the Manifest Anxiety Scale." Child Development 29; 463-472.

Lott, Albert J. and Bernice E. Lott
1963 Negro and white youth: a psychological study in a Border State Community. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

McCandless, Boyd R.
1967 Children: Behavior and Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

McCarthy, John D. and William L. Yancey
1971 "Uncle Tom and Mr. Charlie: Metaphysical pathos in the study of racism and personality disorganization." American Journal of Sociology 76 (January); 648-673.

McClelland, David C., (ed.)
1955 Studies in Motivation. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

McClelland, David D., John W. Atkinson, Russell A. Clark, and Edgar L. Lowell
1953 The Achievement Motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

McKinley, Donald G.
1964 Social Class and Family Life. New York: Free Press.

Merton, Robert K.
1968 Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: Free Press.

Picou, Steven J., Arthur G. Cosby, Evans W. Curry, and Jerry Olivero
1972 "The social psychologies of blacks and whites: different paths to educational achievement expectations." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Sociological Society, April, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Rehberg, Richard A., Walter E. Schafer and Julia Sinclair
1970 "Toward a temporal sequence of adolescent achievement variables." American Sociological Review 34 (February); 34-48.

Reiss, Albert J.
1961 Occupations and Social Status. New York: Free Press.

Rosen, Bernard C. and R. D'Andrade
1959 "The sychosocial Origins of achievement motivation." Sociometry 22 (March); 1 5-218.

Rosenberg, Morris
1965 Society and the Adolescent Self-Image. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Sewell, William H., Archibald O. Haller, and George W. Ohlendorf
1970 "The educational and early occupational status attainment process: replication and revision." American Sociological Review 35 (December); 1014-1027.

Sewell, William H. and Vimal Shah
1968 "Parents' education and children's educational aspirations and achievements." American Sociological Review 33 (April); 191-209.

Sigelman, Marvin
1965 "Evaluation of Bronfrenbrenner's questionnaire for children concerning parental behavior." Child Development 36; 163-173.

Simmons, Robert G. and Morris Rosenberg
1971 "Functions of children's perceptions of the stratification system." American Sociological Review 36 (April); 235-249.

Simpson, Richard L.
1962 "Parental influence, anticipatory socialization, and social mobility." American Sociological Review 27 (November); 512-522.

Slocum, Walter L.
1958 "Educational planning by high school seniors." Journal of Educational Research 51 (April); 583-590.

1966 Occupational Careers. Chicago: Aldine.

1967 "The influence of reference group values on educational aspirations of rural high school students." Rural Sociology 32 (September); 269-277.

Slocum, Walter L. and Lemar T. Empy
1956 Occupational Planning by Young Women. Pullman: Washington Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 568.

Sperry, J. V. and V. R. Kivett
1964 "Educational and vocational goals of rural youth in North Carolina." Greensboro: North Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station, Technical Bulletin 163.

Srole, Leo
1956 "Social integration and certain corollaries: eunomia and anomia." American Sociological Review 21, 220-224.

Stephenson, Richard M.
1957 "Mobility orientation and stratification of 1,000 ninth graders." American Sociological Review 22 (April); 204-212.

1959 "Realism of vocational choice: a critique and an example." Personell and Guidance Journal 35 (April); 482-488.

Strodtbeck, Fred L.
1958 "Family interaction, values, and achievement." Pp. 135-194 in David C. McClelland, A. L. Baldwin, U. Bronfenbrenner, and F. L. Strodtbeck (eds.), Talent and Society. New York: D. Van Nostrand.

Taylor, Lee
1968 Occupational Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ten Houten, Warren D., Tzuen-Jen Lei, Francoise Kendall, and C. Wayne Gordon
1970 "School ethnic composition, social contexts, and educational plans of Mexican-American and Anglo high school youth." American Journal of Sociology 77 (July); 89-107.

Turner, Ralph H.
1964 The Social Context of Ambition. San Francisco: Chandler.

Weiner, Bernard
n.d. "weiner Achievement Motivation Scale." Unpublished. Los Angeles: Department of Psychology, University of California.

Williams, Robin
1970 American Society: A Sociological Interpretation. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Wright, David E.
1968 "Occupational orientations of Mexican-American youth in selected Texas counties." College Station: Texas A&M University, unpublished Master's thesis.